

Remarks

Claims 8 and 15 are amended herein. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the Application.

Rejection under 102(b)

Claims 1-9 and 13-20

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 and 13-20 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ross et al. (5,859,628). Applicant has reviewed Ross et al. and respectfully states that Ross et al. do not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

With respect to Independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 1 includes the features "A processing unit for an electronic instrument comprising... an exposed external electrical contact for receiving an electric signal input; and an exposed external electrical contact for transmitting an electrical signal output..." Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Figures and Specification.

Applicant understands the Examiner to state that Ross et al. anticipates the claimed features with element 206, a card slot. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the card slot is the same as an exposed external electrical contact. Specifically, the exposed electrical contacts of the present claimed feature are shown as features 225 in Figure 2 and defined in the detailed description of Figure 2 in the Specification.

As is clearly observable and clearly claimed, the electrical contacts 225 are not in a card slot or in any other type of protected environment. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that the Claimed features "A processing unit for an electronic instrument comprising... an exposed external electrical contact for receiving an electric signal input; and an exposed external electrical contact for transmitting an electrical signal output..." are not anticipated by Ross et al.

With respect to Independent Claim 8, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 8 includes the features “A portable battery/input/output module comprising... an exposed external electrical contact for receiving an electric signal input; and an exposed external electrical contact for transmitting an electrical signal output...” Support for the Claimed feature can be found throughout the Figures and Specification.

Applicant understands the Examiner to state that Ross et al. anticipates the claimed features with element 504, a card receiving slot. Applicant understands the cradle 104 to contain a card access door 502 of cradle 104 which opens to provide access to card receiving slots 504 in PDA 102. Therefore, Applicant respectfully disagrees that the card access door is the same as an exposed external electrical contact. Specifically, the exposed electrical contacts of the present claimed feature are shown as features 125 of Figure 1 and defined in the detailed description of Figure 1 in the Specification.

As is clearly observable and clearly claimed, the electrical contacts 125 are not in a card slot or in any other type of protected environment. Nor are the electrical contacts covered by an access door. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that the Claimed features “A portable battery/input/output module comprising... an exposed external electrical contact for receiving an electric signal input; and an exposed external electrical contact for transmitting an electrical signal output...” are not anticipated by Ross et al.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully points out that the amended Claim 8 includes the feature of a portable battery/input/output module. Applicant does not understand the cradle of Ross et al. to be a portable battery module but instead to require connection to a power source such as an automobile battery.

With respect to Independent Claim 15, Applicant respectfully states that Currently amended Claim 15 includes the features "A processing unit for an electronic instrument comprising... an exposed external electrical contact for receiving an electric signal input; and an exposed external electrical contact for transmitting an electrical signal output..." as well as the features "A portable battery/input/output module comprising... an exposed external electrical contact for receiving an electric signal input; and an exposed external electrical contact for transmitting an electrical signal output..." Support for the Claimed features can be found throughout the Figures and Specification.

As previously stated, Applicant respectfully disagrees that the card slot is the same as an exposed external electrical contact. Specifically, the exposed electrical contacts of the present claimed feature are shown as features 225 in Figure 2 and defined in the detailed description of Figure 2 in the Specification. Thus, as is clearly observable and clearly claimed, the electrical contacts 225 are not in a card slot or in any other type of protected environment.

Moreover, Applicant understands Ross et al. to provide a cradle 104 to contain a card access door 502 of cradle 104 which opens to provide access to card receiving slots 504 in PDA 102. Therefore, Applicant respectfully disagrees that the card access door is the same as an exposed external electrical contact. Specifically, the exposed electrical contacts of the present claimed feature are shown as features 125 of Figure 1 and defined in the detailed description of Figure 1 in the Specification. Thus, as is clearly observable and clearly claimed, the electrical contacts 125 are not in a card slot or in any other type of protected environment. Nor are the electrical contacts covered by an access door.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 8 and 16 are not anticipated by Ross et al. and are therefore allowable. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection under 102(b) is overcome. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-20 are dependent on

independent Claims 1, 8 and 16 and that Claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-20 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 2-7, 9-15 and 17-20 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Rejection under 103(a)

Claims 10-12

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 10-12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross et al. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Ross et al. for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 10-12 are dependent from an allowable Independent Claim 8. Therefore, Claims 10-12, which depends from an allowable Independent Claim 8, are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base Claim and reciting further features of the present claimed invention.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-20.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 9/27/05



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060